Hist

THE PATRIOT

No. 18.—Vol. II. 8 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

MRS. WEBSTER'S PORTRAIT OF SAINT JUST—See page 5.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Revolution and Its Remedies	1
Letters of a Patriot—No. XI.	2
Notes of the Week	3
Revolutionary Portraits—No. IV.	5
The Bocheviki	6
Unreported Conversations—No. V.	7
Making Ready for Revolution	8
Trade Union Control of the Railways	9
Russo-German Communism	9
British Trade and Foreign Tariffs	10
The Outlook in Ireland	11
"Listening-In"	12
The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy.—No. IX.	13
Correspondence—	
A Second Letter from America	14
National and Patriotic Songs	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY NOV 2 1922 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

REVOLUTION AND ITS REMEDIES.

By DR. EDWARD V. ARNOLD.

The word Revolution, like many others, is changing its meaning in response to a change in circumstances. It used to connote an attempt to alter the form or personnel of Government, and, therefore, regularly raised two practical issues—first, whether the change could be effected, and, secondly, whether it would be a change for the better. According to the answers given, it was conceived possible to give a moral approval or condemnation of any attempt at "revolution."

To-day, however, Revolution usually means not a change of Government, but its complete overthrow. The phrase "abolition of the capitalist system" includes the destruction of the whole social system by which agriculture, industry, and commerce are at present conducted. Those who aim at this destruction no doubt propose some day to rebuild; but as they are entirely disagreed as to the proper manner of rebuilding, that process is left to the distant future, with the consolation offered that "nothing can be worse than the present system." It becomes, therefore, unnecessary to discuss the various Utopias of Socialism and Communism; because in the interval between the destruction and the reconstruction of society the vast majority of the human units out of which that society is constructed must perish. In other words, present-day revolution leads straight to famine and pestilence, and Russia and Ireland stare us in the face as examples of this inevitable result. Now famine and pestilence, like the Flood, may be blessings in disguise, as ridding the world of much rubbish, but most of us regard them as appalling evils, and if this view is correct, then present-day revolution is an evil thing, and should be fought against. Very slowly but surely the mass of sober opinion is coming round to this view.

To fight revolution it is necessary to understand it, and to this end nothing is more valuable than the biographical study of revolutionary leaders, to whatever nation or period they belong. These are of two main types, the doctrinaire and the bandit. The first is over-civilised, and wishes to convert society into a machine. The second is the natural man, or the tiger that is in every man's heart. He longs to riot on the plunder of society's store-house, indifferent to the fact that when the store-house is sacked, nothing but starvation awaits him. The two are unlike in every particular, except that they are sworn enemies of things as they are. The doctrinaire upsets the apple-cart, and the bandit throttles the doctrinaire and runs off with the apples.

The root cause of these two spectres is always the same. A highly organised society is always pyramidal—a series of strata of which the lowest is broad and the highest tapers to a point. The lower strata complain of their material position, saying that they lack food, clothes, and homes. So far they are unreasonable, for they possess far more of these things than they would in a primitive community. But what they really fret against is their subordinate position, from which they cannot hope to rise except by violence. And this grievance of subordination rankles through all the strata, except the topmost. The professional man frets at his daily routine, the rich man's son at his father's control, the politician at the Premier's autocracy. Thus the defenders of society are few, its enemies many, and sooner or later it crashes.

The remedies are many, and have been long tested. Amongst the most effective is the alternative interest. In a religious meeting, a trade society, a musical contest, on a racecourse or in a public-house, men regain their independence and may forget their grievances. Probably at the present moment the Derby is the most effective antidote to Socialism. But the most potent—though the most dangerous—of all remedies is a crusade or a foreign war. Men are astonished from time to time at the strength of a social call when it is invoked to repress the slave trade or to defend the native soil; and again surprised that

when the object is achieved all the old social discontents revive.

When the crisis arrives repression is the only cure. Repression is surgery, and, as such, often necessary, but always painful and dangerous. The Conservative mind is quick to have recourse to it, the Liberal inclines to postpone it until perhaps it is too late. Either way, there are risks; but one thing cannot be disputed: when used, like surgery, it should be resolute and complete. There is no excuse for semi-amputation.

Readers will ask for the application of these general observations to the politics of to-day. The writer is one of those who believe that the immediate danger of revolution in England was brought to an end on "Black Friday," as the revolutionaries (rightly, from their own point of view) name the day when the railwaymen and the transport workers refused to follow the miners to the general strike. The vital feature in that decision was the existence of the Government's Defence Force, and its determination to use it. The precedent will not be forgotten for a long time, though both parties have wisely ceased to refer to it. This being so, the present is pre-eminently the time for the milder remedies in our industrial troubles. Wages have fallen and must continue to fall, and violence, when sporadically attempted, must be repressed; but the main purpose should be to reconcile the defeated party by giving it opportunities of healthy development, in religion and education certainly, but in amusements and displays no less prudently.

Ireland, on the other hand, goes from bad to worse. Unemployment and insecurity are rampant; disorganisation, famine, and plague are not far off. Nationalist, Sinn Feiner, Labourite, and (the word must be and is being spoken) Bandit are fighting to be masters of the ruins of what was, only two years ago, a wealthy community. On the other hand, the conviction is growing—not in one party only—that the surgeon's knife is needed, and that the truest kindness will be the clean cut. Against the disruptive force of mad theories of self-determination which culminates in the cry of "Each man for himself" must be set up the banner of a sane Imperialism, the principle that each man's desire must give way to the common need of an organised life. Of that principle "allegiance" is the watchword, and Great Britain is called to be the guardian.

The Briton has a restless conscience, and is always trying to prove that he is himself in the wrong. But this time the conviction that the Irishman is still more in the wrong is reaching him by way of America. The unanimous approval with which Mr. Winston Churchill's statement was received in Parliament should be warning to all Bandits and to those with whom they have dealings. It is the penultimate step before a declaration of war; of a war in which England will undergo sacrifices and sufferings, but will emerge victorious. "Allegiance" to King George will prove no meaningless phrase, for it means a loyal compliance with the first requirements of civilisation, and such compliance only can save Ireland from an impending catastrophe.

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT.—XI.

Sir,—On the Stock Exchange there is a term, "jobbing backwards," used to describe the futile occupation of calculating how much better off you would have been in the present if you had followed a different course in some past speculation. There is a disposition of the public—cultivated by the politicians and most of the Press—to regard criticisms of the mistakes of our statesmen as a useless "jobbing backwards"; but the analogy is a false one. The elements of uncertainty in share speculation are admitted generally, even with the benefit of expert advice or inside information; but most of the acts of statesmen should be based on principle, on law, and on past experience: they should not be in the nature of a "toss-up," or even of a "straight-tip" from the Prime Minister. Some simple rules can be drawn from past blunders. These would make a few "acid tests" to be kept on the shelf in the Cabinet, as a help to our Ministers in solving questions of complicated appearance. I will try to illustrate both theory and practice.

Test No. 1: Trust the whole people with the whole truth. *No.* 2: No class privileges. *No.* 3: Laws to be enforced regardless of politics. *No.* 4: No meddling with details of industry. *No.* 5: Equal freedom for all. *No.* 6: Protect British interests against enemies of the Empire. *No.* 7: Don't treat enemies better than friends. *No.* 8: Don't mistake clamour for the voice of the people. *No.* 9: Courage pays, even in politics. *No.* 10: Don't worry about what America will think.

If one or more of these reagents had been applied in the solution of the predominant political questions of the last three years, we might have been saved from some of the hundreds of millions loss of wealth production: from some of the deterioration of the moral fibre of the people: from the tightening of the tyranny of an organised section of Socialist Labour; from the disgraceful treatment of ex-Service men; and from the loss of a multitude of former friends of the Empire without the propitiation of a single enemy, but with the result of a serious start made in the Empire's disintegration. A few actual cases from the past will show how the duties of statesmanship could have been lightened, while the interests of the Empire would have been protected.

The countless "Labour" difficulties since the Armistice, which were engineered by Socialist and Revolutionary leaders for the specific purpose of destruction of industry under Capitalism; and did not arise from discontent of the majority of working men. *Tests Nos.* 1, 2, 4, 8, 9.

The miraculous escape of the country from nationalisation of coal mines, when the Government were stampeded into the setting up of a packed Coal Commission, following the injurious war control of the industry, and at the command of our pacifist obstructionists of the war time. *Tests Nos.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9.

The railway strike and final big coal strike stand out as credits to the Government, because they actually did, in effect, apply *Tests Nos.* 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9.

The terrible series of blunders in Ireland, ending with surrender to violence, could never have been committed if there had been application of *Tests Nos.* 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

The dangerous and wobbling policies pursued in India, Egypt, and Palestine would have been prevented by use of *Tests Nos.* 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9.

The sacrifice of our ex-Service men to the power of a privileged class, who claimed the monopoly of the right to build houses and other things, for which the country was suffering, was a breach with freedom and justice, impossible in the face of *Tests Nos.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9.—Yours faithfully, A. P.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

General Election?

There are whispers of a general election, almost imperceptible, like that sighing in still air that preludes a storm. It is known that members who enjoy the confidence of Ministers have lately been inspecting their electoral machinery, an unusual proceeding at this period of the year. Others, less happily situated, have to form their conclusions from a study of Mr. Lloyd George's psychology and methods, and find them pointing towards dissolution.

Indications.

The present Parliament is, for all practical purposes, dead. The Coalition has lost its spirit for work; a process of disintegration has begun; there are symptoms of senile decay, and the Premier's oratory has no longer its old tonic effect. His prescriptions are no longer swallowed with implicit belief in their efficacy; there are even some, in Parliament and out of it, who greatly doubt his medical qualifications, and who are beginning to look out for another adviser. A few months ago, when anyone criticised Mr. Lloyd George, the faithful Coalitionist withered the critic by asking: "but who would you put in his place?"

Possibilities.

To-day the critic is beginning to find an answer to that once embarrassing question. The name of Mr. Bonar Law is mentioned, and it is pointed out that he has shifted his seat from the bench behind Ministers to a seat behind the gangway, and thus proclaims his *independence*. Lord Grey is spoken of—a Liberal indeed, but an *honest man*. There are Conservatives, greatly daring, who quietly talk of Mr. Churchill as a man distinguished from his colleagues by the virtue of *courage*. Honesty, courage, independence—these are great qualities which the country needs and demands, but in which the Government have shown themselves sadly deficient. Mr. Lloyd George, being an acute man, must now appreciate the existence of possible rivals, not dangerous, perhaps, at this moment, but capable of becoming dangerous if things are allowed to drift much longer. He has in fact, to make good, or make way for somebody else.

Temporary Expedients.

For some time he has been able to stave off his difficulties by international conferences, glittering and costly, with plenty of limelight, photographers, and Press agents. But the public are surfeited with these seven-course banquets; they sigh for a dinner of herbs with prosperity and contentment. In this extremity the Prime Minister plays his last card—Ireland. It is not, indeed, quite certain that he has not always kept this card up his sleeve, to be produced at the proper moment. When, some six months ago, he patched up his Irish peace, he may well have been making for himself a political harbour of refuge. If all went smoothly, and Ireland entered the paths of peace, he would claim a renewal of confidence as one who had solved a problem six centuries old. If, on the other hand, Ireland should violate her engagements, he would pose as the man who, having won the Great War, would now again come forward as the champion of British rights and the avenger of loyalist wrongs.

The Irish Policy.

From this point of view the Irish Treaty was not, as some think, a desperate gamble, but a very astute electioneering device. Of course, it was callous. Numbers of loyal Irish folk were doomed to exile, ruin, sorrow, and death in order to subserve the electoral interests of the Coalition. The Irish hell was paved with the Premier's good intentions—for himself. But there it is. We are now told in the Coalition Press that the Government must obtain a mandate for the reconquest of Ireland. And Mr. Garvin excels all his colleagues in the virulence of his denunciation of the impotence and bad faith of the Irish Government. It seems clear that the Prime Minister sees his chance to get another lease of power, by going to the country to ask for its authority to bring Ireland back to civilisation.

Out of the Frying Pan.

Such a move may get Mr. Lloyd George out of his difficulty, but it plunges the electors into another, hardly less formidable. The country wants to see Ireland saved from anarchy and chaos, it wants to see law and order restored, and loyalists secured in possession of their rights and liberties. It cannot refuse its mandate to anyone who will do this. But, can it trust Mr. Lloyd George to do it? Does his Irish record entitle him to any confidence at all? He spoke the Carnarvon speech, and he made the Irish surrender. He has kept hardly a single pledge, or performed a single promise made in 1918. Is he to be trusted to settle the Irish question, for settled it must be this time, once and for all. To do that needs a brave and single-minded statesman, a man of courage above the ordinary, determination and consistency. Has the country any proof, or any hope, that the Prime Minister is so endowed? And yet, it is difficult to see how the country can say no, if the Government ask for authority to reconquer Ireland.

Wait and See.

That is the problem of the moment, which Conservatives have to solve, and solve quickly, unless, indeed, the Irish revolutionaries make some surrender. Should they do so, there will be no election. Mr. Lloyd George will lose his chance of getting a new lease of political life; the reconquest of Ireland will be postponed—for a season.

Faith and Reason.

Mr. Churchill continues to believe in "the good faith" of the Irish Provisional Government, and in "the great act of faith" the Treaty. Upon this question of "faith" we desire to say a word in passing. We see that Mr. Churchill's "faith" is echoed by Mr. Asquith: "The present state of Ireland is a very disquieting one for people whose faith is not deeply rooted." We protest against this degradation of a noble word to an ignoble end. Let our politicians exercise their faith, where faith is required, in the service of God; but in the service of this nation let them exercise their reason, and walk in the light of the evidence. . . . We do not understand Mr. Churchill's methods of thought. He may arrive at his conclusion by that syncopated and almost epileptic process which is called inspiration. But does Mr. Asquith, as a lawyer, oppose faith to an open confession to the contrary? And there is other evidence—ample evidence.—*Morning Post*, 1 June, 1922.

The faith here in question seems to answer to the child's definition—"believing what you know is not true." This country pays high salaries to Ministers to exercise judgment and common-sense, not to gibber about faith when our enemies act according to their nature, and according to all our past experience with them.

Irish Revolutionaries.

The *Communist* of 27 May published an article by Liam O'Flaherty on the Irish Labour movement and its connection with the revolution in Ireland. The writer contends that the leaders of the Irish Transport Workers' Union and of the Irish Labour Party are not revolutionaries. He admits, however, that at its inception the I.T.G.W.U. "was the most revolutionary in these islands. Its membership, under the leadership of Larkin, clearly understood the meaning of the class struggle. Agreements with the masters were of no account, and strikes were the order of the day. The fighting spirit of the Irish proletariat was fed and nourished in the daily struggles with their class enemies." Since Larkin left the country the Union, says this comrade, has ceased to be under revolutionary leadership, "and it is by no means following along the lines of the policy outlined by Larkin," and it "is at present reactionary."

Credit to the Bolsheviki.

We have pleasure in being able to say, at last, one good word for the Bolsheviki. It seems that the starvation they had produced in Russia last summer was so awful that the Soviet Government entered into arrangements with the American relief organisation in a very substantial form, and actually supplied gold to an extent which realised, when melted down in New York, the sum of 11,500,000 dollars. The American Mission sent to administer relief was also furnished with a very large staff of workers in Russia, paid by the Soviet Government, and was allowed the fullest discretion in the distribution of food; so that this reached the real suffering people, and did not go to the Red Army. The Communist Associations in America were extremely annoyed at this Soviet recognition of the independent Relief Commission, as this greatly lessened their harvesting of charitable donations never likely to reach the real Russian sufferers.

President Wilson on Bolshevists.

"In the view of this Government there cannot be any common ground upon which it can stand with a Power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense. There can be no mutual confidence or trust, no respect even, if pledges are to be given and agreements made with a cynical repudiation of their obligations already in the mind of one of those parties. We cannot recognise, hold relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a Government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions, whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt, whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them."

Communists in the United States.

An American just arrived in England says that there are almost as many real Communists in the United States as in Russia, where the people generally are not Bolshevists, and where the Red Army discipline is based wholly on a food foundation. The American Communists are a nuisance, and a threat in every disturbance; but they are, in spite of their numbers, less dangerous than our English comrades of the Red International, because they have not the support of the classes of intellectuals and Socialists who back up every subversive force here through the organisations of the Labour Party, I.L.P., and trade union officials. The great mass of the American people of all classes are patriotic, and free from the blight of internationalism which has fastened on our body politic; so Americans can be counted on to treat revolution with the prompt measures which alone are effective.

American Opinion.

The visit of Mr. Hearst to England will give a fine opportunity for all varieties of anti-British and Internationals to supply evidence for all our iniquities and Imperialism for American consumption. The extraordinary sensitiveness of a lot of our newspapers, and most of our politicians, about what America thinks of our domestic actions is a bad sign of our national flabbiness. If people would only remember the millions of Irish, and Germans, and Bolshevists who do the shouting against Britain they would cease to care for criticism, and would trust to the real Americans, who ultimately govern and mind their own business, while leaving us to mind ours. A little exhibition of patriotism will always secure us more respect among the Americans who matter than all our self-abasement, which is put down as hypocrisy by a race trained to be patriotic from childhood up.

Germany and England.

Travellers differ greatly in the views they obtain of a foreign country, and one story is good till the next is heard; but we venture to give the experience of a lady who has been for a long time in Berlin in a position offering special facilities for meeting all classes. Her conviction is that the people as a whole hate England in a deep-seated manner which contemplates revenge for failure in the war; and the population is patriotic in the old pre-war manner, and Republican only politically by force of circumstances. The children are educated in national ideals. France is accepted as an open enemy, arrogant on occasions, as Germans can easily understand is natural; but England holds in her brainless way the position in the world which Germany made the war to secure, and would have the brains to exploit. The stupidity of the English people, and of their politicians, is as salt rubbed into the wounds of anger and envy. But it is generally admitted that our Prime Minister is an exception to the general stupidity. Lord Haldane used to hold a high position in publicly expressed German opinion; and he deserved it, for he said, "The German Emperor is something more than an Emperor—he is a man, and a great man. He is gifted by the gods with the highest gift they can give. I use a German word to express it—*Geist*. He has *geist* in the highest degree."

Rumours in Cairo.

It is said in the streets and clubs and messes :—

(1) The Zaghlul party has paid a lot to get their case pushed in the English Parliament and Press.

(2) The low rainfall is expected to cause an exceptionally low Nile, which works in with stories the students are spreading that General Allenby's visit to the Sudan was to deflect the water from Egypt.

(3) On the other hand, there are stage whispers of a distinct movement among Egyptians in favour of England and English methods.

(4) It is said in the local papers that Italy, France, and America are opposed to accepting any English guarantee in lieu of the Capitulations, because it is said that, if England can so utterly disregard its own loyalists in Ireland and India, what can any foreigners expect in the way of consideration?

REVOLUTIONARY PORTRAITS.—IV.

By NESTA H. WEBSTER.

SAINT JUST.

Whilst agitators like Danton and Saint Huruge have seen in social disturbances merely an opportunity for profit or excitement, another type of revolutionary has played an equally important part in the movement—the man who craves above all else for power. This desire must not in all cases be attributed solely to ambition; there are always a certain number of people in the world—usually very young men—obsessed by the idea that they were born to remodel the social system and that the happiness of humanity depends on the reins of power being confided to their hands. Fortunately for the human race, their aspirations have seldom been fulfilled, but in France, at the end of 1792, one such youthful theorist was enabled by a disastrous combination of circumstances to achieve a position which placed thousands of his hapless fellow men at his mercy.

Louis Antoine Florelle de Saint Just has succeeded in captivating the imagination of certain modern writers by the romantic beauty of his portraits. It is true that in this respect he presents a pleasing contrast to the other Terrorists whose physiognomies are in almost all cases repellent. But it is doubtful whether he was the Adonis portrayed by flattering artists. The thick hair clustering around the calm forehead, the Grecian nose, the penetrating eyes with their well-marked brows, certainly establish his claim to good looks, but the general effect was marred by the too full, sensuous lips, the fleshy contour of the chin and, above all, by that "greyish pallor" of complexion which characterised most of the revolutionaries of his day.

Amongst all the pen-portraits left us by contemporaries there is one that brings Saint Just before us with extraordinary vividness. We see him standing there before the glass, erect and impassive, arranging with meticulous care the folds of that vast cravat which encased his face up to the ears, the while he dictated to his secretary, in short, rapid sentences, orders for proscriptions in which the word "Death"—"Death" ran out repeatedly like a pistol-shot. No pity stirred this heart of ice, this brain of fire; serene in the consciousness of his unimpeachable "virtue," Saint Just cared nothing for the hearts that were to break, the homes to be rendered desolate as each remorseless phrase flowed from the obedient pen of the scribe with a speed that left no time for punctuation. And whilst the sheets of paper followed each other with terrifying rapidity, the young man standing before the glass continued to arrange and re-arrange the ends of muslin with a careful eye for artistic effect.

It must be remembered that this famous tie of Saint Just's was almost a religion to him. "Saint Just inhabits a cravat," says one of Victor Hugo's characters, and, indeed, he was never seen without it. Only in the strictest privacy would he divest himself of those protecting folds, and no one might enter his apartment brusquely lest they should surprise him at such a moment of relaxation. That high muslin rampart was necessary to his prestige—did it not form the ostensory that held the head of Saint Just, that head which, as Camille Desmoulins declared, "he regards as the cornerstone of the Republic, and carries on his shoulders with respect like a holy sacrament"? Camille lived to repent the imprudent jibe. "I will make him carry his head in another manner!" was Saint Just's reply, and the guillotine did the rest.

The cravat of Saint Just was thus in a sense symbolical; its stiff white crectness represented the idea

ANTOINE LOUISE LEON DE ST. JUST (1767-1794).
From a Portrait in the Musée Carnavalet.

of that blameless virtue and unyielding uprightness which Saint Just and his coadjutor, Maximilian Robespierre, proclaimed at every turn. For had they not made "Virtue and Terror" the "order of the day"? Virtue! The word is eternally on the lips of Saint Just; it runs through all his writings like a refrain of which he never wearies. Yet what is virtue in the conception of this extraordinary young man? Certainly in his early youth "virtuous" was the last word that could be applied to him. Always undisciplined, he had been involved at his native village of Blérancourt in a scandal with the daughter of a neighbour; he had run away from home, taking with him his mother's silver, which he sold to a Jew in Paris for 200 francs—an escapade that brought him six months' detention in a house of correction, where he whiled away his time composing a dull and licentious poem of enormous length. Then suddenly this far from

irreproachable youth discovers that his mission is "to avenge humanity and the poor," and bursts into the Revolution at the end of 1792 as the apostle of "virtue." What does he mean by the word? Nothing, at any rate, resembling the idea it conveys to us to-day. For in that amazing period, distinguished by the reversal of all values, when "patriotism" had come to signify hatred towards the greater part of one's fellow-countrymen, and "justice" stood for condemnation without trial, and "fraternity" was synonymous with fratricide, so many words had lost the sense usually attributed to them or, indeed, stood for precisely the opposite of their accepted meaning, that virtue no longer entailed the exercise of any of those duties towards mankind we are accustomed to associate with the term. It is true that from the autumn of 1792, when he joins the Convention, no more scandals mark the career of Saint Just; the thief and libertine has become *rangé*. Nor do we find him accused of venality, like Danton; in this respect he shares the reputation of the "Incorruptible"—here perhaps he may legitimately claim to some virtue. But he shows himself none the less a perfectly unscrupulous liar, and, as soon as the opportunity offers itself, a murderer on a gigantic scale.

It must not be concluded that Saint Just was by nature cruel. On the contrary, like Robespierre and, indeed, most of his fellow Terrorists, he gave evidence in early youth of marked sensibility. His biographers describe him—in spite of the incident of the stolen silver—as an affectionate son and devoted brother, filled with tenderness for women and children, reverent towards old age and ready to shed tears of "indignation and rage" at outrages on religion. Now that he has achieved power, all his energies are concentrated on the welfare of humanity; he is ready to reform the world according to his own ideas, or, rather, to a wild medley of ideas gleaned from his favourite authors—Montesqieu, Machiavelli, and, above all, Rousseau. There is no subject on which he is not prepared to dogmatise. Without the faintest gleam of humour this young bachelor of twenty-four lays down the law on the necessity for mothers to nurse their babies, gives instructions on the care of infants, formulates laws on marriage, divorce, even on friendship—one of the great principles on which his Spartan Republic is to be founded. It would be laughable if it were not so tragic. For in the hands of this perfectly irresponsible young man—"a precocious child who does not know what he is saying"—lies the fate of hundreds of helpless human beings. And to Saint Just, engaged in the task of regenerating humanity, individual human beings are no more than flies. There lies the whole crux of the matter. Whether or not we believe the stories current at the time of his fearful cruelties, Saint Just stands condemned by his own words. "I will walk willingly," he said, "with my feet in blood and tears." Again: "What constitutes the Republic is the destruction of all that is opposed to it." Or, again: "It is true that a nation can be regenerated only upon piles of corpses."

Yet this atrocious system has found apologists. It would have appeared unbelievable to contemporaries. "It is not impossible," wrote the conventional Beaudot, "that with great subtlety people may attempt to rehabilitate the memory of Robespierre. The thing is impossible in the case of Saint Just. The name of Exterminator will remain to him." But the thing has been done. Saint Just has been glorified by the men who accept the principle on which his atrocities were founded—that the end justifies the means.

THE BOCHEVIKI.

The development of the German-Bolshevist alliance for the exploitation of Russia is accompanied by complications in the world Communist movement. It is not clear to comrades outside Russia how the encouragement of capitalism to reconstruct industry is compatible with the past efforts, and avowed future intention, to destroy Capitalism. The reconciliation of present policy with fixed opposing aims seems to be that the Bolshevists are fooling foreign Governments and would-be traders by encouragement to recreate some wealth and to increase food production in Russia; this merely as a temporary measure necessitated by poverty and starvation; but with all rights reserved by the dictators to revert to unadulterated Bolshevism when desirable. On this subject it is instructive to take the views of an English Communist, Comrade T. Bell, given, after revisiting Russia, in the *Communist* of 13 May, a paper honoured by a series of articles from Leon Trotsky (Bronstein) himself. Comrade Bell says:

For anyone who has been absent from Russia for a time, the most interesting study is the operation of what is called the New Economic Policy. Especially for those who thought the mere institution of proletarian dictatorship would realise Communism and give full-fledged economic security to the industrial masses.

To see all the manifestations of capitalism appearing again is, to say the least, a cold douche for anyone who brings here romantic notions about the Revolution and its achievements.

Enquire where you will as to the meaning of this and that obvious contradiction to stereotyped opinions of revolutionary Russia and the monotonous explanation is always the same—the "new economic policy."

I began to made enquiries as to the attitude of the workers in the factories. In the last analysis it is these workers who count—at least in the big cities and industrial centres. In conversation with a responsible Communist Party official I learned that the party were quite satisfied with the general attitude of the workers, who have in no way slackened in their revolutionary determination.

The workers realise that all the concessions to the petty bourgeoisie and the accompanying paraphernalia in the shape of speculation and trading are only manifestations of the transition period to Communism, and that fresh battles have yet to be fought before such forms of capitalism as yet remain are finally crushed.

And so when the lying journalists of the poisonous capitalist Press in England try to persuade their readers that Communism has failed, and incidentally to bring comfort to the tortured souls of the bourgeoisie, who are seeing red at their own doorsteps, we can afford to smile. As the politicians say in the English Parliament: "The situation is well in hand."

The zig-zag manner in which events are forcing our Russian comrades to move may be puzzling to the comrades in other countries not yet in the throes of revolutionary action. We have read and heard of an army anxious to go into battle, but restrained by a wise generalship. Retreats have been ordered even against the will of the rank and file eager to fight. The generalship of the Russian revolution and this new economic policy represents exactly such a situation.

If the Communist leopard has not changed his spots, then what sort of a beast is this new compound animal, the "Bochevik"? for the Boche end of it is certainly not going to be satisfied with supplying capital and ability in order to have the other end swallow it all. But if the leopard is really removing his Communist spots, and allowing Russians to express themselves and own property, what is to prevent the coming of the long-overdue pogrom? The correct answer is probably that the leopard end of the firm will break away in time, and leave the Boche in possession as saviour of the Russian people; while the marked Bolshevists will take their plunder to England and find other worlds to conquer—say, Palestine.

UNREPORTED CONVERSATIONS.

V.—FRIEDRICH WILHELM II. AND THE DUKE OF BRUNSWICK.

"Dear, dear; what a bore it is having to accompany the army! Minerva and Mars aren't in my line. I wish Uncle Fritz had adopted Cousin Karl. He's much better fitted than I am to be the Manager of a firm of House-breakers. . . . Is that you, Karl? Come in! I should like to see the Manifesto again before it is issued."

"It's already in the hands of the printers, but here's a corrected proof. . . . You will observe I have altered it considerably."

"*Altered* it! Why wasn't I consulted first? Has Francis approved the alterations?"

"Yes. But don't be alarmed! The Manifesto's only a second edition of the Pillnitz Declaration."

"You've a stronger memory than I have. What did I and Leopold say in the Declaration last October?"

"Last August, you mean. You said that you considered the situation of Louis and Marie-Antoinette a matter of common interest to all European sovereigns, and that Prussia and Austria were resolved to establish in France a monarchical government, conformable alike with the rights of sovereigns and the welfare of the French nation."

"Yes, yes, I remember; but I've never understood why Leopold fell into that trap? He didn't want a war with France, and the sentimental idiot appeared to be genuinely concerned about his sister's fate after she was lugged back from Varennes. Did you bribe Kaunitz and Thugut?"

"I thought we'd agreed that Prussia's foreign policy was *my* department."

"Do you suppose, Cousin Karl, I've forgotten Uncle Fritz's death-bed advice? He had a high opinion of you, Karl, ever since you married George's sister and tricked Grenville into taxing the Americans. I've never told you before, but uncle's last words were: 'Trust Karl; he's another devil incarnate.'"

"Put that on my tombstone if I'm killed in the war. Now, just glance through the manifesto."

"Dear, dear; my word, this is pretty strong, isn't it? '*Their Imperial and Royal Majesties declare on their faith and word as Emperor and King that if the château of the Tuileries is forced or insulted, or the least violence or outrage committed on the King, Queen or Royal Family, and if provision is not immediately made for their safety, preservation and liberty, they will inflict a signal, rare and memorable vengeance by delivering up the City of Paris to military execution and total overthrow, and the rebels guilty of such attempts to the punishment they have merited.*' That's a death sentence for Louis and Marie-Antoinette, isn't it?"

"You're shrewder, Cousin, than I suspected. Von Clootz and Marat report that the scene at the Tuileries on June 20 has caused all the decent people in Paris to rally round Louis, and that Lafayette is organising the reaction. Unless we spit in the face of the French nation, all our labours since '40 will have been in vain."

"Candidly, Cousin, I don't like this move of yours. What would Kant say to such a plan?"

"Kant be damned! If he opens his silly mouth I'll let Goethe loose on him. Besides, Kant, with all his fine talk about Categorical Imperatives, knows which side his bread's buttered. Isn't Königsberg in Prussia? He wouldn't care to lose his job."

"Don't underestimate Kant, Karl! His ideas are making a lot of headway at the Universities."

"Aren't you ever going to grow up, Cousin? Leave that to me. If we encourage more duelling, drinking, smoking and music at the Universities and send some women there, Kant won't be able to play the Pied Piper much longer. We'll appoint Colonel von Blücher Inspector of Universities when the campaign's over, and I'll order Goethe to write a 'Critique of Impure Reason.' By the way, I've sent for Goethe. He's to lie in the journals. A clever fellow, this Goethe."

"He has no morals, has he?"

"None at all."

"Good; he should be useful to us. Voltaire's and Wieland's books have become a trifle stale. Tell me, Cousin, what's Schiller doing? I thought his 'Don Carlos' capital. It showed up the Hapsburgs splendidly.

"He's at present mugging up the Thirty Years' War. His history of it won't make the French, Swedes, Hapsburgs and Austrians more popular in Germany."

"Shouldn't he stick to plays? They are more persuasive than histories. Think how Beaumarchais helped us with his 'Figaro.'"

"You aren't paying a compliment to Voltaire's memory. Voltaire's histories have been of inestimable value. A menu with nothing but *entremets* does not suit our swine-headed Germans. They wolf history as if it were pork."

"Talking of pork, have you found a successor to Lessing?"

"Not yet; but I'm on the look out for one. The Mendelssöhns are sampling writers."

"Seeing what services the Jew Marat and his compatriots are rendering in France, and the importance of the Jews in Poland, you won't neglect that side of our propaganda?"

"My dear Cousin, I wasn't born yesterday. 'Mais revenons à nos moutons.' You approve of the Manifesto?"

"If it doesn't come off, I shall, of course, declare that it was issued without my authorisation."

"Of course."

"How far do you propose to conduct me into France?"

"Not beyond the Argonne. I've arranged with Dumouriez for a sham fight in that district."

"Poor Colonel von Blücher will be very disappointed! He has expressed to me his wish to take part in the sacking of Paris."

"The character of von Blücher, Cousin, is perfectly familiar to me. Paris is, however, out of the question. You can't conquer twenty-five million of Voltaire's tiger-apes with a hundred thousand or so professional murderers in uniform. Our business is to cause the Revolutionary pot to boil over, and to run Austria into France. While Austria and France are at fisticuffs, you and Catherine will be able to cut more slices off Poland. The dismemberment of France must be left till later."

"Couldn't you extend our tour to Reims? If we blew up the Cathedral there, we should badly damage the prestige of the French Monarchy. Goths have the right to destroy Gothic architecture, and Colonel von Blücher is fond of vineyards."

"No, no, Cousin. Strategy forbids. But—Fritz in Heaven!—it's 5.30 p.m., and I haven't finished my Order on Peasant-shooting. Till the First Loot!"

MAKING READY FOR REVOLUTION.

THE NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION.

From time to time we read in the Press of prosecutions undertaken against men who advocate at public meetings in our big industrial centres the forcible overthrow of our institutions. These prosecutions, though they do not deal with a tithe of the revolutionary propagandists in our midst, do, at any rate, serve to illustrate to the unthinking public that there is an organised movement for the forcible overthrow of our institutions. But why is it that the Home Office—or whatever department is charged with the work—never goes beyond taking action against individuals? Why is it that organisations such as the Communist Party of Great Britain and the British Section of the Red International of Labour Unions, which are openly and admittedly working for a violent revolution, are never under any pretext interfered with? Few people can have any idea of the number and activities of the revolutionary and quasi-revolutionary organisations that carry on propaganda in our midst. In addition to the two I have mentioned, there are, among others, the Socialist Labour Party of Glasgow (whose secretary, Comrade Mitchell, is now serving a short sentence for sedition), the National Workers' Committee Movement, the Glasgow Anarchist Communist Group (the leading personality here is Comrade Guy Aldred, who is also serving a term of imprisonment), the National Administrative Council of the Organised Unemployed (an extreme Bolshevist organisation, which was responsible for the recent disturbance at Poplar, when Mr. George Lansbury was imprisoned in the board room for a number of hours). All these bodies are blatantly revolutionary, as can be seen from their newspapers. The Organised Unemployed publish a miscellaneous sheet, filled with ungrammatical balderdash, called "Out of Work," which is particularly worth noticing by anyone who is interested in the way in which poverty and unemployment are being deliberately exploited by our professional mischief-makers. There are also a large number of quasi-revolutionary bodies, such as the National Guilds League, the Union of Democratic Control, the I.L.P., and the Irish Labour Party of Great Britain, whose principal function is to act as a training ground for the full-blown agitator.

Now although all these organisations are admittedly and openly working to bring civilised government down in ruins, there is never the slightest attempt made by those responsible for law and order to interfere in any way. The utmost that is ever done is to prosecute occasionally some comparatively harmless local agitator. The Government will take action against Comrade Jones, of Newcastle, or Comrade Smith, of Glasgow, for demanding the robbery and extirpation of the bourgeoisie; but why is it so afraid to lay hands upon the organisations who pay these minor people their salaries and provide them with matter for their propaganda? Is it not ridiculous folly to interfere—however half-hearted and inadequate the interference may be—with the local soapbox Bolshie and agitator while leaving his paymasters and superiors at absolute unfettered liberty? If we had a Government which was alive to its responsibilities, and which was determined to stop this contemptible policy of truckling to disorder, the first step that would be taken would be the suppression of the Communist Party and the British Section of the Red International of Labour Unions, and the Socialist Labour Party, and all the other cliques of subsidised renegades and aliens who are seeking to overthrow this Empire. Society is entitled to protect itself, and if our Communists and Bolshevists and imported red-raggers refuse to accept the democratic institutions of this country and organise themselves in parties to bring about a violent revolution, let them be treated like other criminal undesirables and deported—to Russia, for choice.

There is no country in the world which permits such uncontrolled propaganda of anarchy and sedition as Great Britain. In the United States, where the prospects of revolution are considerably less menacing than at home, the Communist Party is an illegal conspiracy: and anybody who deliberately makes war on society is very soon laid by the heels. When he was in England, that notorious demagogue Jim Larkin enjoyed complete liberty to preach his detestable doctrines: but on transferring his activities to the United States he was promptly sentenced to ten years' penal servitude for criminal anarchy.

Imagine the uproar if Comrade Tom Mann or J. T. Murphy or Arthur MacManus, or any other of our home-grown revolutionaries were even charged with sedition! When the Secretary of the Communist Party, Albert Inkpen, was sent to prison some months ago for circulating seditious literature there was a perfect avalanche of protests: a letter to the Home Secretary was written, signed by such well-known loyalists as Bertrand Russell, Bernard Shaw, J. R. Clynes, M.P. (Chairman of the Labour Party and a member of the Privy Council), Mr. H. M. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*, and others, in which Mr. Shortt was adjured in the most fervent terms to "release Inkpen": demonstrations, speeches, resolutions, requests for release from Trade Unions, and other Labour bodies, votes of sympathy from public bodies on which there was a Labour Socialist majority, flowed in on the Home Office: Mr. Inkpen was even nominated (by the Labour Party, of course) as a candidate for the London County Council. It was a remarkable example of the well organised way in which the revolutionaries conduct operations.

Our tolerant attitude towards the advocates of disorder and civil strife might have had some justification for it previous to the war; but to-day, when a revolution is within measurable distance, it is treason to the community. Never since the Armistice have the times been so propitious for the demagogue and the incendiary. With Revolution marching to triumph on the other side of St. George's Channel, with millions of wage-earners either unemployed or on part-time, with the head of the State recently hobnobbing with Revolutionaries at Genoa, we are fools if we shut our eyes to the probabilities.

In the interests of organised society the Government should at once suppress the Communist Party and all the other groups and parties working for a revolution: it should deport, as criminal undesirables, the mob of aliens who are subverting our institutions: and it should prohibit with the severest penalties the transmission into Britain of the stolen funds of the Third International and the payment of our Bolshevists from the Soviet Treasury. If our rulers are unable or unwilling to do this, in Heaven's name let them give place to others who realise that we must act promptly if we are to save society.

L. C.

TRADE UNION CONTROL OF THE RAILWAYS.

During the present month the new and expensive machinery agreed upon between the railway companies and the representatives of the three railway unions, viz., the National Union of Railwaymen, the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, and the Railway Clerks' Association, will come into being and commence its functions. It is doubtful if the public in general, and railway shareholders in particular, realise the meaning and purport of this machinery, or the revolutionary change now being initiated in the conduct of what is, probably, our greatest national industry, founded and operated on the basis of private enterprise.

The trade unions, led by the Right Hon. J. H. Thomas, P.C., M.P., have not only secured the right of recognition as the intermediary between railwaymen and their employers, but have succeeded in obtaining authority, supported by Parliamentary sanction, to act on behalf of the majority of the employees and minor officials in most matters affecting or arising out of their employment.

It is unnecessary in this article to explain in detail the whole scheme of local departmental committees, sectional councils, and railway councils; it will suffice to say that the great army of railwaymen, whether willing or unwilling, unionists or non-unionists, will be compelled to accept the unions as the arbiters of their industrial destinies, and as their negotiators, and gradually to expect their material sustenance from trade union channels. Moreover, the various phases of operation will be subject to the criticism of the unions' officials, and that of the advanced section of the trade union element.

It had long been the aim of modern trade union officials to obtain recognition of their organisations which would stabilise their positions; but it is doubtful if any one of them in his wildest dreams ever foresaw the privileged and autocratic power he now holds. The Railways Bill, 1921, now passed as an Act, perpetuates the unions as the potent factor in railway operation, at a time when efficiency and economy are more necessary than ever, and when the railways have to meet unprecedented competition, and are saddled with huge wages and salaries bills.

The majority of railway directors and chief officers are hoping that the meetings of the various councils and committees will merely provide an outlet for the emission of harmless steam or gas, but the trade union leaders are congratulating themselves upon the acquisition of a share in control, which will provide useful experience in administration, and assist the railwaymen to take complete control when eventually the railways are controlled by the workers. If this means anything at all, it means that the ultimate aim of the trade unions is to dominate industry, and if the present policy is pursued, it will not be long ere such aim is brought within the scope of practical politics on the railways.

It may be that, having regard to the events of the past few years, little harm could result from the setting up of machinery which would enable railway manual workers to air their grievances and to make representations to their officers, but there can be no justification for bringing under trade union control those minor officials of the railways who directly supervise and instruct the men in their duties, and upon whose vigilance, loyalty, and faithfulness so much depends. By the very nature of their employment these men must be true to their salt; they must in times of dispute or trouble be on the side of their employers, and must regard their employers' interests as their own. They cannot serve the railway companies and the unions at one and the same time; cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Whatever political or other views are held by leading railway officers who do not come much in contact with the rank and file men, the men of the stationmaster and supervisor type should be absolutely above board, if efficiency is to be maintained. To allow the same union to have a voice in the conditions of service of the porter and stationmaster, the labourer and the senior inspector is foolhardy; to compel them to have common membership in the same organisation by making no domestic provision for the non-commissioned and warrant officers of the railway service is very wrong, and an early amendment of the Act is necessary.

The three railway unions are affiliated to the Labour Party, which is avowedly out to bring about nationalisation and socialisation of all industry. The way is well paved for the railwaymen under the unions to give a lead in that direction, and it will require wise statesmanship upon the part of our railway chairmen and directors to avert trouble.

JOHN TRACKMAN.

RUSSO-GERMAN COMMUNISM.

The Beckwith Company, of New York, have republished an important address by Dr. Weston B. Estes, formerly in the Military Intelligence Section of the United States Army, describing his experience of prison and hospital life in Soviet Russia. This acute observer confirms the accumulating evidence as to the nature and objects of the Soviet tyranny. He gives striking examples of the universal corruption practised by Lenin's officials, and he shows clearly that Jews—and Jewesses—are in full power. His general conclusion is that the so-called Communist movement, which has wrecked Russia morally and materially, and which was carried out by emissaries forwarded from Germany, is not what it pretends to be.

"Do not forget," he says, "that in the system which has been used so beautifully and so precisely for the destruction of Russia and for its subjugation at the hands of the German Jewish bankers; there is not one political principle, there is not one sociological fact which was not employed by those who were in control of the French Revolution, and who had exactly the same object in view—*domination*. . . . You have before you worked out a programme which has produced in Russia a vacuity of brains and ability, left behind unlimited unskilled labour, and a political condition which can yield nothing but eventual control from external influences."

As Mr. Peter Beckwith points out, Dr. Estes discovered and forcibly explains that "*Communism was never intended to be successful, but was designed for and used as a means of destruction.*" This fundamental fact has not yet dawned on the minds of the Prime Minister and his colleagues, although, as a guide to British policy, it is vital.

BRITISH TRADE AND FOREIGN TARIFFS.

By E. T. GOOD.

In the twelve months ended 30 April, 1922, twenty-nine countries have revised their tariffs, mostly upward, and on wider foundations. Some States have revised their tariffs twice since the Armistice. Many goods hitherto on the free lists have been put on the tariff lists. In nearly every case the duty has been seriously increased. In some cases new and baffling rules have been adopted. These wholesale tariff manipulations, coming when international exchanges are abnormal and erratic, are bewildering. They are trade blights. And at the back of some of these new tariffs there are sinister designs without parallel in modern times. It is time the whole resources of the British Empire were organised for the defence of British commerce. We are up against some serious propositions. We may not like the idea of Protection or Retaliation, but we may have to adopt it. We did not like the idea of militarism, but recently had to defend our national existence by the sword. We may yet be driven to defend our economic status by the Tariff. At all events, we had better take stock of the general situation.

Let it be conceded right away that foreign nations have a perfect right to impose all the tariffs they like, and to subsidise their ships and traders as they choose. Let it be frankly recognised that some of the biggest industries in the world have been created and developed by the tariff and the subsidy. But let it not be forgotten that, as international traders, we have some rights. We are the greatest importers—we are the best international customers—in the world Our market is worth something. We have set the Free Trade example for seventy years. Our market has been free and open. Our Navy has maintained the real "freedom of the seas." Our coaling stations, like our ports, have been at the free service of the world's shipping.

In return for all this, what have we got? The idea of international Free Trade recedes farther and farther into the background. No important State will follow our example. The new States that have arisen out of the war, largely through British instrumentality, are clapping tariffs on our goods, and penalising our traders in a manner that would do credit, or discredit, to the oldest Protectionist country in the world. The country which during the war prated loudly about "equality of trading conditions between the peoples of the world," and loudly re-echoed Germany's cry for the "freedom of the seas," has introduced a Tariff Bill which surely marks the limit of red-hot Protection, and is taking measures to severely penalise our shipping in its waters.

The United States Tariff Bill, known as the Fordney Bill, introduced a year ago, and then withdrawn whilst the Washington Conference for the abolition of British naval supremacy was being called and conducted, is now reintroduced in all its naked deformity. Among other things, this Bill provides that high-speed tool steel imported into the United States shall carry the ordinary 20 per cent. duty, an additional duty of 15 per cent. in consideration of the vanadium or chrome content; a further duty of 72 cents per pound weight in respect of the tungsten content; a special duty so that in no case can imported steel be cheaper than the home-produced article; and, finally—and this is the real sting—a stipulation that all the contents of the steel and their exact proportions shall be openly stated on the invoice.

The new Spanish tariff is a typical example of what is being done. In 1920 we took over £42,000,000 worth of Spanish produce, of which only £3,000,000 worth contributed to our Customs. We sent to Spain £23,000,000 worth of goods, practically the whole of which had to carry heavy duties. Now Spain increases her tariff. Not only so, but there is an active agitation for the exclusion of British coal from the navy, railways, and other services, although the Minister of Marine admits that 150 tons of our coal will do as much work as 220 tons of Spanish coal, and the Government has gone a long way to meet this agitation. The quantity of British coal is to be strictly limited.

Then there is France. A year ago France imposed an additional 40 per cent. on our steel, and now there is a keen agitation for another increase. We give France a free market. We are even losing our much-advertised "most favoured nation" treatment. Brazil, for example, has just granted preferential tariffs on American and Belgian products, but not on British.

We shall be obliged to consider how much longer we can afford to be a nation of Free Traders in a world of Protectionists. If we cannot have universal Free Trade—if we cannot have even two or three great Free Trade nations in the world—is it worth our while to remain in the fiscal wilderness? Trade is international, and that Free Trade which is not international—which is not reciprocal—is incomplete, if not a sham. Not only have we to face the fact that we stand no shadow of a chance of securing universal Free Trade, but we ought to consider why we even hold up such an ideal. Suppose that we could get universal Free Trade, what would happen? That international trade which is not something like equal and fair is not worth much. Under universal Free Trade we should certainly get extremely unequal and unfair conditions. We have a large number of nations with different resources, aptitudes, and living standards. In these days of cheap and rapid ocean transport, how can the high-living nations compete, and permanently maintain their standards, against cheap-labour nations, if there are no protective or equalising tariffs? Tariffs, with all their faults, are the only means of equalising international competition? When it cost £5 to bring a ton of goods from the East to the West and before the East was industrialised, we had natural protection. But as freights go down to a few shillings, and as Oriental nations become efficient in manufacturing and engineering, and develop their resources, there will be nothing but the protective tariff to stand between us and ruin. To-day we see rivals not only protecting their own industries and penalising ours, but we see them planning extravagant schemes to subsidise their traders in competition with ours. Nothing can be more calculated to encourage them in this policy than our failure to defend our own industry and commerce. Nothing could do more to check these foreign tariff and subsidy movements and to equalise international trading conditions than a united British Empire movement in the defence of British trade and traders. We had to become a conscript nation in order to beat down Prussian militarism. We shall have to become a Protectionist nation before we can do anything to lower the huge tariff walls that are erected against us.

THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

Contempt of England.

It has frequently been urged on former occasions that if the Treaty was to be carried through, some strong declaration on the part of His Majesty's Government was essential in order to make it clear that the limit of concession had been reached and that the Treaty must be fulfilled in the letter and the spirit. Had such a statement as Mr. Churchill made in the House of Commons been made early in the year, it is almost certain that, however closely the Treaty and the Republic were allied even at that time, the country would at least have been saved the appalling losses brought upon it by the disorders consequent on the Treaty, and the full and accurate description of the present conditions with which the speech closes would never need to have been made. It is probable that, now the declaration has come too late, Republican ideals have strengthened greatly since the beginning of the year, very largely from the idea that England was too weak financially, militarily, and politically to make even the faintest attempt to assert its authority or to stand firm against any vigorous attempt to make a united advance towards complete independence or to extract more from the Treaty than it was intended to give. In short, the view is that England may be treated with absolute contempt, and it is this view that is the underlying principle of the Collins-de Valera pact. Owing to the apathy that prevails in Ireland as to the pact, the conference in London and the statement in the House, it is hard to say as yet what effect recent developments will have; Mr. de Valera alone has spoken, and his words—"Mr. Churchill's threats do not affect us. We deny the right of any English authority to prescribe what Irishmen shall or shall not do"—do not promise peace or security for the future.

If this view is, as is likely, the view of the majority, the conflict will at once arise on the question of the Republican members signifying their acceptance of the Treaty before they are allowed to hold office in the new Government, a point on which Mr. Churchill necessarily laid considerable stress, involving as it does a complete repudiation of the Treaty.

Unceasing Campaign of Anarchy.

The Irish delegates, as was expected, put forward the view that their agreement with the Republicans would enable them to establish a greater measure of liberty and security than was possible when they had to deal with the armed forces of the Republicans as well as with the very small (according to them) body of bandits that are responsible for the campaign of outrage. It is, however, absolutely true to say that since the pact there has as yet been not the slightest sign of any diminution in the campaign of anarchy and lawlessness. The confiscation of landed estates and the expropriation of the loyalist owners still continues unchecked. The enforced exodus of Protestants and loyalists is increasing daily, and is extending to districts which all through the last few years enjoyed practical peace and freedom from disturbance.

The Loyalist Exodus from Ireland.

The Provisional Government in the letter quoted in the House by Mr. Churchill states that "it is a matter of common knowledge that in accordance with the settled policy of an organised movement which has for its object the discrediting of the Provisional Government a considerable number of persons have left Ireland on the plea of compulsion without any justification for that plea."

Apart from the extreme unlikelihood of any persons leaving their native land voluntarily, abandoning everything they possess and their only means of livelihood to live in poverty till they can make a completely fresh start in life in surroundings absolutely foreign to them, it is in the last degree improbable that any thought of the Provisional Government or of discrediting it enters into the minds of those responsible for the campaign.

The Question of Compensation.

There is another point in the letter which is important to notice: the Provisional Government admit their liability to compensate the victims, but lay stress on the outrages in the North. Now on the analogy of their previous dealings with Ulster, it always remains open to them to make the compensation of Southern loyalist victims dependent on the payment by the British Government, the instigators they say, of the Northern pogroms, of compensation to the Catholics of the North. There is surely an obligation on His Majesty's Government to secure compensation for the loyalist victims and on behalf of their loyal subjects in Southern Ireland, and to adopt at least the same measures for their protection which they have undertaken by the Treaty of Peace for the victims of a very similar persecution in Turkey.

The Modus Operandi.

As to the outrages themselves, the course usually adopted is that an armed gang visits the intended victim and orders him and his family out at once, allowing them to take nothing with them. It is to be remembered that the loyalists are defenceless, all arms having been taken from them by the British Government. The servants and employees are allowed to remain to avoid causing distress, and the expropriated owner, who, when driven from his lands, is often without a sixpence in the world and absolutely unable to obtain credit from the banks when his lands are gone, is ordered to provide for their remuneration, otherwise his goods will be sold to meet expenses. In such a case—which is now of everyday occurrence—it can hardly be denied that there is justification for the plea of compulsion. But in other cases a written threat is conveyed to the owner or the armed visitors give a few days' grace. In many of these latter cases representations made to the Provisional Government have resulted in the reply that the threats are not genuine and may be disregarded, but no offer of protection is made. Such a course may enable the Provisional Government to say that the plea of compulsion is unjustified but it is hard to see what difference it makes to the defenceless owner whether the armed gang which expropriates him has any genuine authority or merely drives him out for "their own personal gain or for private revenge or out of a pure love of disorder and confusion."

Provisional Government Incompetence.

All respect for the rights of property has vanished in most parts of Southern Ireland, yet in any country which is to claim even the most elementary form of civilisation the rights of property must be respected in a very different manner from that in

which the Provisional Government has attempted the task during the last six months.

Mr. Churchill's speech shows the difficulties which beset the Irish delegates, who, in order to account for their violation of the Treaty in the Collins-de Valera Pact, were compelled to state openly and clearly the appalling state into which the country has been allowed to drift. At the same time they were compelled to minimise the extent of the Republican opposition, even at the risk of laying themselves open to the unanswerable charge of the grossest incompetence in conducting the affairs of Government. Mr. Churchill in his speech set out the Irish delegates' view as to the conditions which prevent the holding of a free election at present, which, if true, is certainly "a very terrible reflection on the Irish people and on their capacity to use the democratic institutions to which they have so long and so loftily proclaimed their devotion," but it is also a very terrible reflection on the British Government in handing over the destinies of the Irish people to a body of men who confess their incapacity to hold an election when opposed by only two per cent., as they themselves say, of the whole population. The truth of the assertion as to the strength of the respective parties is at least open to question. It is, indeed, highly probable that the conclusion of the Pact was due to a fear as to the result of the election on the pro-Treaty side, who would naturally prefer the maintenance of the status quo to the risk of losing their newly acquired importance.

The Aim of Complete Independence.

But assuming that their views as to the relative position is correct, as it is extremely unlikely that any Irishman would deliberately lay himself open to a charge of incompetence unless some very material advantage was to be gained, some other motive must be looked for to explain the state of anarchy to which the country has been allowed to drift and the consequent alleged necessity for the Pact, and the motive can be found in the desire to profit by the apparent slackness hitherto shown by the British Government since the Treaty and to make that advance towards complete independence which almost all the pro-Treaty party have asserted the Treaty enabled them to make.

Continuing the Game of Bluff.

Hence it is unlikely that Mr. Churchill's speech will make any material difference in the situation, and the game of bluff will go on in Ireland. New methods may be necessary to conceal their real intentions and to enable Ministers to find some excuse to ask for continued patience on the part of the British public; but as long as it is possible to count on slackness on the part of the British Government and a desire to postpone any firm decision on the points at issue, so long will the principles of the Pact be maintained, and these principles are inconsistent with anything else than the establishment of a Republic.

The British Government must Act.

Mr. Churchill assured the House that the Government would act with vigour if it found that the confidence it still reposed in the Irish Signatories was misplaced. It is too early as yet to say what interpretation will be placed on his speech in Ireland, but it must be remembered that the British Government is now looked on with absolute contempt, and it is greatly to be feared that mere words from it will affect no change in Ireland, but that if the Republican ideal is to be laid aside once and for all, action—and strong action—and not mere appeals for patience, will be necessary.

"LISTENING-IN."

That "Gamboge" journalist from the U.S.A., W. R. Hearst, and his wrong-headed right-hand man, Arthur Brisbane, have come over here to see if we are as black as they have painted us. If these "gentlemen" are not colour-blind, they will see, that, despite our politicians, this is *still* a "White Man's Country"—and consequently "no place" for them.

* * *

Journalism makes strange bedfellows. The new *John Bull* on its cover a week or two ago gave, amongst the names of its principal contributors, Earl Haig, Arnold Bennett, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, and A. G. Gardiner—the latter's special article being a vitriolic attack on our friend and Ally, France. I wonder how the gallant Field-Marshal liked being featured in company with the ex-editor of the *Daily News*.

* * *

In the "Diary of a Man about Town" in the *Evening News* of 19 November, 1921, "Quex" wrote as follows:—"A shrewd handler of men, and an actual one 'in the know,' has bet me that the Irish problem will be solved before two months are over, and he seldom loses cash." I wonder if "Quex" has yet "handled" the cash lost by the one "in the know."

* * *

The British taxpayer has received many "electric shocks" during the past year or two, but not one of them of more violent voltage than the news of the granting by High Commissioner Sir Herbert Samuel of Paradise—I beg its pardon, Palestine—to Herr Rutenberg (Kerensky's ex-chief of police) of the concession for electrical supply works within his (the High Commissioner's) bailiwick. Herr Rutenberg is evidently a "live wire," but it is confidently hoped that his commercial "current" will be cut off by the action of Sir Wm. Joynson-Hicks, M.P., and his supporters in the Commons.

* * *

When Winston Churchill was taunted in the House of Commons not long ago about the release of de Valera when the latter "hero" was arrested prior to the so-called "Truce," with compromising documents on his person, he (Winston) posed as a political Izaak Walton, and flippantly stated that the sporting fisherman often threw back into the water the "little fish" caught by him, so as to have the pleasure later of hooking them when they had grown to "fish-hood," or words to that effect. Winston's *wee* de Valera stickleback has not taken long to develop into a "Sinn Fein super-shark."

* * *

I have an idea that on the wall of the "Dope the Press Department" in Downing Street the late Professor Schreiner's well-known words: "Five-sixths of the people in this country allow their newspapers to do their thinking for them" are prominent in bold type, and suitably framed; also that, guided by this sapient saying, the Political Press agent issues an order to his journalistic *clientèle:* "Create an atmosphere about ——" At once the "Hot Air" scribes get busy, and the caloric current is wafted far and wide throughout the land. Suddenly and silently there comes along the "Cold Blast of Truth," and the result of the meeting of the "Airs" is: 1. "Fog"; 2. the "Crash": 3. the "S.O.S." from the "Warm Goods," for the old adage, "*Veritas Prevalebit*" still endures.

"Radio."

THE GERMAN - BOLSHEVIK CONSPIRACY.

MR. EDGAR SISSON'S REPORT—IX.

Owing to pressure on our space we have been unable to give further extracts from Mr. Edgar Sisson's report on the German-Bolshevik conspiracy in our last two numbers. The following, however, are further extracts from this remarkable report :—

DOCUMENT NO. 36.

G. G.-S. Intelligence Bureau, Section R, No. 136.

(Very Secret.)

28 November, 1917.

To the Council of People's Commissars :

In accordance with your request, the Intelligence Bureau of the General Staff informs the Council of People's Commissars that the Ukrainian Commission at the Austrian High Command, in which participate the empowered representatives of the German Staff, has worked out a plan of the activities of the revolutionaries known to the Council of People's Commissars and the Central Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies —Chudovsky, Boyarsky, Gubarsky, and Piatakov—who are under the full direction of the Austro-Hungarian High Command.

The commander-in-chief of the Russian army has been made acquainted by Schott with plans of the Austro-German High Command and will co-operate with him.

Head of Bureau : AGASFER.

NOTE.—At this early time there was harmony all around on the Ukraine program, Germans, Austrians, and the Commissars in complete brotherhood. Schott is Major von Boehlke, and Agasfer is Major Luberts.

Have photograph of letter.

Trotsky and Roumania.

The machinations of Trotsky, inspired by the German General Hoffman, for the disruption of Roumania are disclosed in the following :—

DOCUMENT No. 37.

Counter Espionage at Army Headquarters, No. 20,

January 2, 1918.

To the Commission on Combating Counter Revolution :

Commander-in-Chief Krilenko has requested the Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters to inform you that it is necessary to order the following persons to the Roumanian front immediately : From Petrograd, Commissar Kuhl, Socialist Rakovsky, Sailor Gnieshin ; and from the front the chief of staff of the Red Guard, Durasov. These persons should be supplied with literature and with financial resources for agitation. To them is committed the task of taking all measures for the deposing of the Roumanian King and the removal of counter-revolutionary Roumanian officers.

Director of Counter Espionage : FEIERABEND.

Secretary : N. DRACHEV.

NOTE.—This marks the continuance of large-scale work to disorganise the Roumanian army. That it advances disappointingly to Germany is evidenced by vengeful steps taken by General Hoffman and Trotsky from Brest-Litovsk, when in the middle of January (Western calendar) Trotsky, at the request of General Hoffman, ordered the arrest in Petrograd of the Roumanian Minister Diamandi. (See Document 37A.)

At about the same time the Roumanian public gold reserves in custody within the Kremlin walls at Moscow were seized by the Russian Government. Diamandi was released from arrest at the demand of the united diplomatic delegations at Petrograd, but his humiliations continued, and on January 28 he was ordered from Petrograd, being given less than ten hours to prepare for the departure of a party that contained many women and children. Ambassador Francis sought in vain of Zalkind, who was acting as Foreign Minister in the absence of Trotsky again at Brest, for an extension of the time of departures. The Roumanian party was thrown pell-mell on a train at midnight. It was delayed in Finland on one excuse and another, not immediately apparent, but in three weeks the Minister, leaving behind a large part of his people, was allowed to proceed to Torneo. By good luck he reached there the day after the Red Guard lost Torneo to the White Guard. That day saved his life, for on the person of Svetlitzsky, a Russian commissar, who joined him in mid-Finland and accompanied him to Torneo, was found an order to Timofeyeff, the commissar at Torneo, to shoot him. Svetlitzsky was shot instead. When I passed through Torneo the control officer talked frankly about the details, expressing the opinion that the shooting might have been a mistake, as it was not shown that Svetlitzsky was aware of the contents of the letter. Svetlitzsky, however, was an important person in Petrograd, close to Trotsky. Our American party brought Guranesco, the first secretary of the Roumanian delegation, out of Finland through the lines with us. He had been in Red Finland seven weeks. Behind us at Bjorneburg we left several families of Roumanians who had departed from Petrograd with the Minister. We would have liked to have brought them through the lines of the two armies, but our venture was too desperate to permit unauthorised additions to the party.

The marginal notation on this letter is "Execute," initialled "Ch," the sign manual of Chicherin, the returned exile from England, at that time Assistant Commissar of Foreign Affairs, now Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT 37A*.

*The contents of this letter, written by Joffe, were telegraphed to Washington in February, and photographic copy of letter forwarded by Ambassador Francis to State Department.

No. 771, Affair of Peace Delegation.

(Confidential.)

Brest-Litovsk, December 31, 1917.

To the Council of People's Commissars :

Comrade L. Trotsky has charged me to bring to the knowledge of the Council of People's Commissars the motives for his telegraphic proposal to arrest the Roumanian diplomatic representatives in Petersburg.

General Hoffman, referring to the conference which had taken place in Brest-Litovsk between the members of the German and Austro-Hungarian delegations on December 29, presented to the Russian delegation in the name of the German and Austrian Chief Command (a deciphered radiotelegram was exhibited in this connection) a *confidential demand* concerning the immediate incitement of the Roumanian army to recognise the necessity of an armistice and adopting the terms of a democratic peace pointed out by the Russian delegates. The implacability of the staff and the whole commanding force of the Roumanian army, with regard to which the Chief Command of the German army has received the most exact agency information, spoils the excellent impression produced in Germany and on all the fronts by the Russian peace propositions, which has made it possible *to again stimulate the popular feeling against England, France, and America, and bring about an undesirable and dangerous aggravation of the peace question, up to the German army going over to the attack on our front and an open annexation of the territories occupied in Russia.*

The general expressed his opinion that against peace might be the Cossacks, some Ukranian regiments, and the Caucasian army, in which case they will also doubtless be joined by the Roumanian armies, which, according to the information in possession of the German staff, enters into the calculations of Kaledin and Alexieff. It is greatly in the interests of the German and Austrian delegations that complete harmony should prevail on the entire Russian front as regards the conclusion of an armistice and adopting the terms of a separate peace between Russia and Germany, seeing that in this event the German and Austrian Chief Command will propose to Roumania their terms of peace, and will be in a position to take up their operative actions on the Western front on a very large scale ; at the same time, General Hoffman, in the course of a conversation with Comrade Trotsky, twice hinted at the necessity of immediately beginning these war operations.

When Comrade Trotsky declared that at the disposal of the council's power there are no means of influencing the Roumanian staff, General Hoffman pointed out the necessity of sending trustworthy agents to the Roumanian army, and the possibility of arresting the Roumanian Mission in Petersburg, and repressive measures against the Roumanian king and the Roumanian commanding forces.

After this interview Comrade L. Trotsky by cable proposed to arrest the Roumanian Mission in Petersburg with all its members. This report is being sent by special courier—Comrade I. G. Brossoff, *who has to personally transmit to Commissar Podvoisky some information of a secret character regarding the sending to the Roumanian army of those persons whose names Comrade Brossoff will give.* All these persons will be paid out of the cash of the "German Naphtha-Industrial Bank," which has bought near Boreslav the business of the joint-stock company of Fanto and Co..

The chief direction of those agents has been entrusted, according to General Hoffman's indication, to a certain Wolf Vonigel, who is keeping a watch over the military agents of the countries allied with us. As regards the English and American diplomatic representatives, *General Hoffman has expressed the agreement of the German staff to the measures adopted by Comrade Trotsky and Comrade Lazimiroff with regard to watching over their activity.*

Member of the delegation: A. JOFFE.

[Marginal Notations.]

Comrade Shitkevitch: Take copies and send to the Commiss. for Foreign Affairs, personally to Comrade Zalkind.

[Passages printed above in italics marked:] To Sanders. Reported January 4, regarding the arrest of Diamandi and others.

M. SHITKEVITCH.

January 5, 1918.—To the Chancery: Send an urgent telegram to Trotsky about the arrest of the Roumanian Minister.

SAVILIEFF.

1. LENIN (Ulianoff), President of the Commissarics of the People (Bolshevik).
2. SPIRIDONOVA (Social-Revolutionist).
3. PODVOYSK, Commissary for War (Bolshevik).
4. KOLONTAY (woman), Commissary for Public Charity (Bolshevik).

NOTE (as cabled February 9).—The date is January 12 (Western calendar), the eve of the Russian New Year. The Roumanian Minister was arrested that night in Petrograd, and only released on the united demand of all embassies and legations in Petrograd. Since then he has been sent out of Russia. The letter shows that Trotsky took General Hoffman's personal demand as an order for action. Most important of all, however, it strips the mask from the Lenin and Trotsky public protestations that they have sought to prevent the peace negotiations with Germany from turning to the military advantage of Germany against the United States, England, and France. The aim here disclosed is instead to aid Germany in stimulating feeling against England, France, and the United States, in enabling Germany to prepare for an offensive on the Western front. A German bank is named as paymaster for Bolshevik agitators among the Roumanian soldiers. Is "Wolf Vonigel," the field director, the Wolf von Igel of American notoriety? The similarity in name is striking. Finally, General Hoffman and the German staff is satisfied with Trotsky's watch over the American and English diplomats. Joffe, who signs the letter, is a member of the Russian Peace Commission. Since this letter was written Zalkind has gone to Switzerland on a special mission.

NOTE (July 6, 1918).—He did not reach there, being unable to pass through England, and in April was in Christiania.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

To the Editor.

A SECOND LETTER FROM AMERICA.

Supping with the Devil.

Sir,—What is noticeable to an observer in America is the way public opinion in Britain reacts on opinion here. Official Washington is only too conscious of the fact that there is such a thing as "English propaganda," and that it is well organised as an aid to the diplomacy and interests of the British Government—particularly during the Genoa Conference.

Americans are incorrigible idealists. The nation followed the course of the Washington Conference from that standpoint, and saw in the settlement of the issues victories for the American idea. An almost iridescent atmosphere was created. Suddenly into this limelight effect walked an even greater than Harding or Hughes, calling the nations of the earth to the Sion's Hill of Genoa. Instantly Lloyd George's publicity experts, without so much as by your leave, spread the pure atmosphere of the Washington Conference round the new centre of confabulation. American opinion went with it. And it seems incredible that, despite the farce enacted there, and the repeated affronts given to the Welsh climber by Germans, Russians, and the American Government, "English propaganda" for Lloyd George has apparently prevailed over Press and public. The same limelight effects of rosy hope and optimism now suffuse The Hague.

The victory of the Georgian propaganda is, however, more apparent than real. The explanation of the victory lies elsewhere. The schemes of Lloyd George also happen to forward the schemes of everything in this country which is anti-British, or which makes for Germany. For instance, the average Jew in the U.S. is an enemy of the British Empire—and a "fan" for Lloyd George. This is a most easily observable and significant fact. Strange, is it not? The New York press is mostly owned by German Jews. The Hearst press is anti-everything which is not subversive. The "English" papers they quote are mostly the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Daily News*, the *Westminster Gazette*, the *Nation*, and the *Daily Herald*. The unfortunate result is that the propaganda for Lloyd George is also adopted by the real American press, which cannot resist the lead thus given it on "idealism."

The semi-official *Washington Post* of May 12 gives us the exact attitude of the U.S. Government towards Lloyd George. Its leading article categorically lays down the American view as follows:—

"Many incidents strengthen the opinion that an informal understanding was reached weeks ago whereby Mr. Lloyd George agreed to bring about political recognition of the Soviet régime, if possible. The reiteration by the United States of its refusal to extend recognition until and unless the Soviet has proved that it has returned to the rules that bind civilised society together, stands as a barrier against secret bargains at Genoa which might admit a Communist government into universal international intercourse."

Even the American "highbrows" will soon be seeing that the political opportunism and radicalism of Lloyd George is serving the Red cause in the United States. But what is particularly nauseating about "English propaganda" is that the Welshman's scribes, such as Mr. Garvin and Sir George Paish, besides tearing out their very entrails to befoul our noble ally, France, are poisoning their shafts with Red bedevilment. No doubt their Russian communications have corrupted their perfect manners; but the effect of their stuff on the American public is mixed. If England be proved a villain to-day (as might suit the book of the U.S. Government) France would be the heroine to-morrow. There is no doubt that the U.S. Government is alive to certain dangers; it has set its face as flint against the recognition of the "detrimentals" among the nations, and speaks by the mouth on that point through the *Washington Post*.

The danger ahead is that many of its citizens are not firmly grounded in the political realities. The Fourteen Points are to them fourteen political possibilities. A murder gang anywhere—that is, anywhere outside the U.S.—that gets itself called a "Republic" and a "Government," and yells "self-determination,' is immediately heard by the New York and Hearst Press and taken, if not all at once, into its bosom then, at any rate, into its columns—and the thing is done. It is a cause. The South has a Lost Cause—of rebellion. The Democratic Party (now out of power) is the party of this Lost Cause, of the Irish cause, of any cause that has a

growth and has votes. It is also the cause of Wilsonism (of which more anon). Senator Borah, a power in the Senate, is their mouthpiece. A thing must be rotten, like a medlar, before this good man will touch it. Now the Russian cause is clamouring for recognition, and Borah blesses it. If then Lloyd George gets his way at The Hague the Republican Party will have to—well, do all it knows Unfortunately, it does not know enough. In exploring slimy avenues for peace and votes the Democratic Party knows its way about better. With a Russian "Republic," a Russian "Parliament," and a "Premier" Lenine, a slogan of "Peace with Russia," might reverse the course of American history. It would also greatly perturb Samuel Gompers, the leader of American labour and a determined anti-Bolshevik. But it would be grist to the mill of Z. K. Foster, the leader of Red labour.

There is a story in Washington that a religiously crazed countryman of Lloyd George convinced him that Satan had been unchained on earth with all his angels, and that the Prime Minister thereupon immediately asked a Jewish secretary to issue His Satanic Majesty an invitation to breakfast. Thus getting together he sounded the fiend on the matter of a conference, to "save the world." The name of the publicity expert in this matter was said to be "Lord Bottomley." Be this as it may, another danger which the vicious propensity of Lloyd George for "supping with the devil" has brought on the political horizon of the U.S. is the fillip which the quasi-recognition of the Russian Bolsheviks at Genoa has given to the long continued and widely supported agitation for the recognition of Mexico. Certain Mexican leaders have had their portraits retouched in a section of the Press till they look like nature's gentlemen. The U.S.A. has hitherto refused to recognise that country for the same reasons as apply to Russia. Meanwhile a few straws show the drift of certain forces working for the Bolshevation of Mexico, whose borders march with the U.S. Belasco, in his book on Mexico, definitely shows that Obregon came into power through the help of a gang of militarists and radicals. There has been a general sequestration of landowners, who have been paid in Government bonds, more worthless than Russian roubles. Payment of interest in the national debt has been suspended. The oil and other industrial interests of capitalists have been practically expropriated through taxation. There is a distinct anti-Spanish movement amongst the half-breeds and Indians, supported by the Radicals. A report from a Jewish organisation in Chicago stated that the Mexican Government intended to assist Russian Jewish emigrants and pay them one dollar a day for some years. A labour delegation from the U.S. recently visited Mexico City to assure Mexican labour unionists of their support in the fight against capitalism. All this has followed German propaganda during the war, when the Mexican Government was actively pro-German. And, of course, the Mexican Radical Government would have more hope with the American Democratic Party.

America, however, has other anxieties than as to how the propaganda let loose at Genoa will react on Mexico and certain South American States. America's prosperity is felt to be bound up with the prosperity of the world. Before the war this prosperity was bound up with the free circulation and safe investment of capital. But under present conditions of social unrest the existence of a public debt or of foreign investments in a country may be made the cause of Red incitement for the establishment of a Communist "government." Money lent to a state may be used indirectly to subsidise politicians who seek to make political capital through advocating measures of confiscation. The investment of American money abroad must be retarded till these causes of lack of confidence are removed once and for all. It is therefore well to consider what may be the reactions of Genoa on the possibilities of capitalistic investment, which is America's means of helping the world.

Before slamming the door in Lloyd George's face at Genoa and inviting him to call again at the back door of The Hague, the Russians nailed to the mast for all the world to see their principles of Communism. These principles imply certain "rights," which are destined to be better read when formulated through the usual channels of Bolshevik dissemination. They are as follows:—

1. The sovereign rights of a state to do what it likes inside its own territory.
2. The inviolability of such rights.
3. The right of confiscation.
4. The rights of nationalisation.
5. The right of repudiation of obligations.
6. The right of propaganda with any other state if within the law.

It will be noticed that the first five rights are pure doctrinaire absolutism. But it is because these "rights" are conveyed in the guise of doctrines that they are essentially wrong. That the above "rights" have the support of precedents, as the Russians have cleverly shown, signifies nothing as to their value as doctrines. The precedents of the past were the result of policies of expediency, and are only evidence that the course of history took not the course of political designs, but of the line of least resistance. None the less, as doctrines they are the stuff with which to wage propaganda against "capitalism."

Owing to the "informal understanding" of Lloyd George with the dark forces of revolution there has been thrown on to the world's platform, where they need never have come, certain issues as to "the rules which bind civilised society together." About the integrity of these vital rules Lloyd George is prepared to compromise. Possibly France will yet attend The Hague and save civilisation again. Until these issues are settled—and they will not be settled at The Hague—neither the U.S. Government nor Wall Street will be, as we have seen, in a position in which they know whether the investment of American capital will work towards reconstruction or will help to breed Bolshevism. Already Chicherin has in pickle for The Hague, as a means of inciting further proletarian unrest, certain demands on behalf of the "proletariats of the world," which will, of course, preclude all possibilities of economic production. The engagement of the forces between the nether world of Bolshevism and the upper world of civilisation draws closer. Lloyd George has drawn the United States of America into the conflict, and their Government is not on his side. The issue is unlikely to be bloodless, for the upper world has insufficient mental force to win a victory by spiritual means alone. Events are now rapidly pushing even Lloyd George into the camp to which he belongs.—Yours, etc.,

SCARAB.

P.S.—In my remarks last week on the Jewish part in the revolutionary movement, I omitted to quote a very curious and significant passage from the *American Hebrew* of November 25 last. This paper, I may explain, is the organ of right-wing orthodox Judaism in America. In an appreciatory notice of Krosnochikeff, a Jew, and the "First President" of the Far Eastern Republic (Siberia), it informs us that "in 1905 he arrived, aged 16, in the United States, worked at his trade . . . all the time organising Soviets, lecturing, studying law, and editing a Russian paper. He returned to Vladivostock *in July*, 1917 (my italics)."

NATIONAL AND PATRIOTIC SONGS.

Sir,—Many years ago, someone—whose name I forget—said: "I care not who makes the laws of the country if I may make its ballads." May I, through the medium of your valuable paper, most earnestly ask those who believe in the truth underlying this statement to do all they can to encourage the teaching and singing of our national and patriotic songs, including such songs as "The Englishman," "Nil Desperandum," "Sunny Days will Come Again," "Better Late than Never," "Cheer Boys, Cheer," "Do Your Duty Manfully, and Never Mind the Rest," and many others of a like type which were so much sung fifty or sixty years ago, and which would be as popular as ever if known to the present generation, having such attractive melodies and stirring choruses? I believe that something has already been done in this way by clergy and schoolmasters, but I think they may perhaps have found the same difficulty that I have had: in not knowing where to obtain a cheap collection of such songs. I am glad to say that at last I have found what I wanted, published by William Reeves, bookseller, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.C., who has already brought out two volumes, at 1s. 6d. each. They are very well got up, nearly full music size, and have, in addition to the usual notation, the Tonic Sol-fa system. A third volume will shortly be published. I feel confident that the frequent singing of these songs throughout our country and Dominions would do much to counteract the spirit of Socialism everywhere. I am happy to hear from friends in Tasmania that national and patriotic songs are now being taught there in a very novel manner. The matter has been taken up by musical people, and the movement is called "Community Singing." The Mayor of Hobart has had the Town Hall opened every day at the dinner hour, when national songs are sung, and anyone who cares to do so is asked to join in, and it is said to be a great success. The movement has spread to other places in Tasmania, where they have community singing once a week, and there also it is a like success. Would it not be a good thing if those connected with the Village Club movement would follow the example of Tasmania and introduce "Community Singing"?—I am, dear, sir, yours faithfully,

J. TUDOR SKINNER.

THE PATRIOT

No. 18.—Vol. II. 8 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

THE IRISH REGISTRATION BUREAU

(Compensation Claims Committee),

64, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

During the past few weeks a large number of Refugees have arrived in London from Southern Ireland. They represent all classes of persons, viz:—

1. Large landowners who have had their homes and estates seized by armed men, and their property and personal effects confiscated;
2. Their dependents;
3. Working farmers, small traders, professional men who had established local businesses and industries;
4. Ex-Government employees, such as retired R.I.C. men and ex-soldiers (in many cases these men had retired up to twenty years, had married and settled down in small grocery and other businesses); ex-Post Office officials, railwaymen, farm labourers, etc.;
5. Englishmen who had made their homes in Ireland, and against whom there was no complaint except that they were English.

The methods adopted against these people show a co-ordinated movement to expel from Ireland everybody who is even suspected of having, at any time, shown British sympathies.

The expulsion is not confined to Protestants, although in some districts—notably West Cork—nearly every Protestant trader and small farmer has been expelled at the point of the revolver, and many of their relatives have been shot. A very large number of the exiles are Roman Catholics, and in politics were members of the old National Party of Mr. Redmond. The armed bands have made a special set against all those who either sent their sons to fight in the British Army or who assisted recruiting in Ireland during the European War. In most cases these people have arrived in London with nothing but the clothes in which they stand

A representative body of the refugees visited the House of Commons on Monday, May 8, and were received by over 100 members of Parliament, to whom they stated their case at a meeting presided over by Sir John Butcher. The meeting was extremely sympathetic, and passed a resolution urging the Government to render assistance to them. The Cabinet have set up a small Committee at the Irish Office under the Chairmanship of Sir Samuel Hoare, and this Committee has power to make small grants to very necessitous cases only.

The Irish Loyalist Defence Fund, which has for the past two years been assisting necessitous cases of Loyalists expelled from Ireland, has also been able to deal with a certain number of very pressing cases. The funds, however, are quite insufficient to deal with so large an exodus of poor people. There was a strong feeling expressed by members of Parliament at the meeting that it would be a good thing if all the cases of hardship could be investigated and recorded, and it was suggested that an organisation for this purpose should be formed.

Accordingly at a meeting of the refugees it was decided to open the Irish Registration Bureau at 64, Victoria Street, Westminster.

This office is now in working order, and any person requiring advice and assistance is recommended to communicate there with the Secretary.

The Bureau does not itself dispense money in necessitous cases, but a Committee sits which investigates any claims brought before it, and, where a small grant is required to assist the applicant in his immediate necessity, his application is forwarded either to the Irish Distress Committee at the Irish Office, Queen Street, Westminster, or to the Irish Loyalist Defence Fund, 25, Victoria Street, Westminster. But a very large number of the cases are of people who were in moderately good circumstances in Ireland, but have been deprived of their homes, their living, and all their personal effects. They claim that they are entitled to compensation for loss and damage. The Compensation Claims Committee at the Bureau take all these cases into consideration. The cases are recorded and advice is given in each case as to what steps should be taken for forwarding the claims. As soon as the majority of the names of claimants have been ascertained, it is intended to form the claimants into a strong Association for mutual co-operation and protection of their interests, and it is expected that a Deputation representing the Association will be received by the Cabinet Ministers and a statement of the claims submitted, with a view of obtaining just treatment for them as British citizens domiciled in the Free State.

The Committee have already considered the Constitutional question, and are proposing to submit a case to a leading Constitutional lawyer for advice as to what rights are retained by British citizens in Ireland under the Irish Free State Treaty.

The work which the Committee have to undertake will require an expenditure of money, and, as most of the refugees—even those who were comparatively well-off—have been deprived of everything, an appeal is rendered necessary.

Subscriptions from well-wishers of the movement will be gratefully received. Cheques should be made payable as follows:—

(*a*) For grants of immediate relief to necessitous cases—*to the Irish Loyalist Defence Fund;*

(*b*) In support of the Compensation Claims and expenses of the Bureau—*the Irish Compensation Claims Committee.*

All communications to be addressed to the Secretary, Irish Registration Bureau, 64, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

THE PATRIOT.

Copies of THE PATRIOT can be obtained either through the usual agents or direct from the publishers:

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, WHITEFRIARS STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Single Copies, 6d.; or 7d. post free.

Terms of Subscription:—

3 months, 7/6; 6 months, 15/-; One year, 30/-.

The Publishers can supply Vol. I, bound in cloth, 13 issues, complete with Supplements, at 15/-

Published by THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.